

to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

#90 A

Dear Beau,

In your letter of October 12 you express disappointment that you don't have my "faith and respect." I'm not sure what you mean. If you mean that you would have expected me to accept uncritically everything that you do, then I think the expectation was unreasonable. Would you accept uncritically everything that I might do? Since my arrest I have trusted people again and again. Again and Again my trust has proved to have been a mistake: Denvir, Clarke & Co.; their hired shrinks; Greenberg, Mello, Bonnie; journalists like Christine Craft and Peter Klebnikov, among others. Would you seriously expect me now to trust anyone more than I have to?¹

It must be clear to you by now that while we get along very well in a personal sense, we have big problems with regard to the handling of practical affairs. To me your style of action appears hasty and overconfident, and consequently careless. The result of this that bothers me most is that

1. The one person whom I trust without reservation is
I think I have good reasons to trust her more than anyone else, yet even in her case I'll have to admit that my trust is not entirely rational, but is based partly on the fact that I need to have someone whom I can trust completely.

you say things that later turn out to be inaccurate. (E.g., your assurances about libel problems, your repeated setting of publication dates that couldn't be met, and now your implied assurance that Dubner would write the kinds of things you said he would write.) Equally serious, your ideas about publicity and the media are at odds with mine.

In your letter of October 4, page 2, ¶3, you wrote, "Nothing that I consider valid in the promotion of your book, including [60 Minutes], would go beyond the selling of your book. That is how books are sold."

Correction: That is how a very small minority of high-profile books are sold. I feel safe in assuming that of all the titles published in the U.S. each year, only a small percentage are ever discussed on national TV shows.

Anyway, the long and the short of it is that I don't want you to manufacture a public image for me, whether intentionally or as a by-product of the selling of the book. I don't know whether that was going to happen, but I'm worried that it might happen. So I'm putting you on notice that I will hereafter give no interviews for mainstream media, and that I don't want you to make any public statements about me personally (as opposed to statements about the book).

I'm certain that you're quite sincere

when you say that you care about me, but at the same time your understanding of me is incomplete and your goals, values, and judgments are very different from mine. That's why I'm worried about what you're going to do with publicity.

So where do we go from here?

~~Here's~~ Here's what I propose:

1. The last-minute changes that Miller made in T.v.L. are to be undone, except that Miller, if he likes, can propose some changes that are far less extensive. If this is okay with you, let me know, and I'll fix up the text to suit myself, incorporating those of Miller's changes that I feel are acceptable. If the text then suits you too, we will at last have an agreed-upon text.

2. We should prepare an addendum to the contract along the lines that I proposed in my letter #89.

3. Until steps 1 and 2 are completed, we will not know definitely that Context will ever publish T.v.L. Hence, until steps 1 and 2 are completed:

(a) You make no statements to the media about me or about T.v.L., and you answer all questions with "no comment"

(b) With or without a confidentiality agreement, you give no one a copy of T.v.L. without my consent.

(c) No excerpts from T.V.L. are to be offered to any periodicals.

4. After steps 1 and 2 are completed, you can go ahead with publicity, but I will not participate in your publicity campaign. Publicity is to be about the book only and not about me personally.

5. If we can't arrive at agreement in regard to items 1 through 4, then we will terminate the contract. Many months ago I had an offer from another publisher (not Regnery), and more recently they sent me a reminder, so if you want to terminate the contract I won't have a problem with that.

* * *

Please let me know how you feel about the foregoing proposals.

If you have copies of the tapes of the Dubner interview, please send copies of them to Quin Denvir. Thanks.

* * *

Okay, let's be at peace. I'm still upset about recent events, but by and by I'll get over being sore at you.

Best regards,

Ted

P.S. Here's an idea that I forgot to mention. I understand that one can protect oneself from a libel suit in the following way: If you're going to publish negative allegations about X, you give X a chance to answer the allegations. If X answers, you publish his answers along with the allegations. If X declines to answer, you can publish the allegations without fear of a libel suit.²

Maybe this could be applied to T.v.L. as follows: You, as publisher of T.v.L., assume the role of a "neutral reporter." You're publishing my allegations. You offer to certain people mentioned in the book the right to respond. If they do respond, you publish their responses in the same volume. Even if this would not protect me from a libel suit (which I don't care about), maybe it would protect you from a libel suit. You might want to ask Miller about this.

- Ted

P.P.S. A couple of points that I forgot to cover:

(i) In my letter #86, page 1, ¶2, I wrote, "I can't ask you not to exercise your First-Amendment

2. I received this information from Fischler and Sucher.

rights with regard to me " I've changed my mind about that. As noted above, I am asking you not to exercise your First-Amendment rights in regard to me. I think this is justified, because if you hadn't gotten involved in publishing my book it's unlikely that you would ever have made any public comments about me anyway. Any ~~po~~ public comments about me that you might make henceforward would be an outcome of your publication of T.V.L.

(ii) On pages 1 and 2 of Letter # 90, I quoted some passages from your letters to me.

(a) Can I have your permission to quote these same passages in Truth vs Lies? To avoid causing you embarrassment, I will avoid using your name and refer to you only as "Mr. X." (b) Can you confirm that the passages quoted on pages 1 and 2 of Letter #90 accurately reflect what you were told by Dubner and by representatives of Talk Magazine.

(iii) I have learned that the statements I made about . on page 2 of Letter #86 were incorrect: She offered her article neither to the Boston Globe nor to Harpers. I was misled by something that Blake Davis told me.

Ted